

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed June 23, 2004. Claims 1-35 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-35 were rejected. Claims 1-35 remain pending in the Application.

In the Office Action, the following actions were taken or matters were raised:

SECTION 102 REJECTIONS

Claims 10-15, 17-20 and 22-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Humphreys et al., *WireGL: A Scalable Graphics System for Clusters* (hereinafter "*Humphreys*"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Of Claims 10-15, 17-20 and 22-28, Claims 10, 19 and 25 are independent. Applicant respectfully submits that *Humphreys* does not disclose or even suggest each and every limitation of amended Claims 10, 19 and 25. For example, *Humphreys* does not disclose or even suggest "a traffic controller . . . operable to . . . control a data transmission rate of at least one of the plurality of second resource units to synchronize the collected data" as recited by amended Claim 10, a "controller means . . . operable to control a data transmission rate of at least one of the plurality of second resource means to synchronize and composite the plurality of second data" as recited by amended Claim 19, or "synchronizing the plurality of sets of pixel data for an image frame from different sources by controlling a data transmission rate of at least one of the different sources" as recited by amended Claim 25.

Humphreys does not appear to disclose or even suggest controlling a data transmission rate of at least one of the sources of image data to synchronize the received data as recited by amended Claims 10, 19 and 25. To the contrary, *Humphreys* recites that "the compositing server is simply another WireGL pipeserver accepting glDrawPixels commands and parallel API synchronization directives" (*Humphreys*, section 4.2, second paragraph, lines 8-10) (emphasis added). Thus, the compositing server of *Humphreys* apparently synchronizes data based on directives received from the pipeservers, in contrast to Applicant's claimed

invention where a data transmission rate of at least one of the data sources is controlled to synchronize the data. Thus, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that amended Claims 10, 19 and 25 are not anticipated by *Humphreys*.

Claims 11-15, 17-18, 20, 22-24 and 26-28 that depend respectively from independent Claims 10, 19 and 25 are also not anticipated by *Humphreys* at least because they incorporate the limitations of respective Claims 10, 19 and 25 and also add additional elements that further distinguish *Humphreys*. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 11-15, 17-18, 20, 22-24 and 26-28 be withdrawn.

DOUBLE PATENTING

The Examiner provisionally rejected Claims 1-35 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-39 of co-pending application no. 10/086,060. Applicant has reviewed the present and co-pending applications and respectfully traverses this provisional rejection at least because the claims of the present application are patentably distinct from the claims of co-pending application no. 10/086,060.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

No fee is believed due with this Response. If, however, Applicant has overlooked the need for any fee due with this Response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment associated with this Response to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 of Hewlett-Packard Company.

Respectfully submitted,

By: James L. Baudino
James L. Baudino
Reg. No. 43,486

Date: 9-21-04

Correspondence to:
L.Joy Griebenow
Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400
Tel. 970-898-3884